

STATE OF FLORIDA

COMMISSIONERS:  
JULIE I. BROWN, CHAIRMAN  
ART GRAHAM  
RONALD A. BRISÉ  
DONALD J. POLMANN  
GARY F. CLARK



OFFICE OF THE GENERAL COUNSEL  
KEITH C. HETRICK  
GENERAL COUNSEL  
(850) 413-6199

# Public Service Commission

October 9, 2017

James Beasley  
J. Jeffry Wahlen  
Ausley & McMullen  
Post Office Box 391  
Tallahassee, Florida 32302  
[jbeasley@ausley.com](mailto:jbeasley@ausley.com)  
[jwahlen@ausley.com](mailto:jwahlen@ausley.com)

**STAFF'S FIRST DATA REQUEST**  
*via email*

**Re: Docket No. 20170199-EI - Petition for approval of conservation street and outdoor lighting conversion program, by Tampa Electric Company.**

Dear Mr. Beasley:

By this letter, the Commission staff requests that Tampa Electric Company (TECO or utility) provide responses to the following data requests.

1. Provide the charts included in Exhibit A, in electronic (Excel) format with formulas intact.
2. Please provide supporting documentation demonstrating how each factor was calculated in the company's cost-effectiveness analysis inputs presented on Exhibit A, page 5.
3. Please provide supporting documentation on how the unamortized depreciation capture value was determined.
4. Please explain whether the company has sought to recover remaining unamortized costs in rate base for any other assets within the last ten years. For each type of asset, please specify through what mechanism the company sought this recovery (base rates, fuel clause, etc.), and in what proceeding recovery was approved.
5. Please specify where in Rule 25-17.008, Florida Administrative Code, recovery of unamortized depreciation capture is included in the cost-effectiveness analysis.
6. Would the Company move forward with the change in its tariffs proposed in Docket 20170198-EI, if the proposed DSM program is denied. If so, why? If not, why not?

7. Please specify if participation in the proposed DSM program is voluntary or mandatory and please explain your response.
  - a. If participation is mandatory, please explain how the program qualifies as a demand-response program.
8. Please specify what monetary incentives, if any, are provided to customers by the company through this program, excluding the energy and demand savings of the device.
9. Please refer to Exhibit B. Please explain the inclusion of a 10 percent field inspection rate for equipment to be installed by TECO, instead of equipment reported by customers. As part of your response, explain whether TECO typically performs field verification of its own equipment.
  - a. Please specify whether this verification would require any administrative costs, and if so, where those are included in the cost-effectiveness analysis for this program.
10. Please refer to paragraph 5 of the petition. Provide an estimated monthly residential rate impact (\$/1200-kwh-mo) of the proposed DSM program.
11. Please refer to Exhibit A of the petition, page 2. Explain the basis of the assumed participation rates.
12. Are any customers receiving lighting service located outside of TECO's service area? If so, please specify how many.
13. Please refer to paragraph 12 of the petition. The company notes that \$50,000 would be spent on an advertising/communications campaign.
  - a. Is the company seeking cost recovery of these funds through the ECCR? Please explain.
  - b. If the response to (a) is yes, please identify where in its cost-effectiveness analysis this value was included.
  - c. If the response to (a) is yes, please provide a copy of the cost-effectiveness analysis including it.
14. Please provide an annual and cumulative comparison of the company's current FEECA goals and the savings of the proposed program.
15. Based on the purported benefits of LED lights and the statement that cities and communities have a strong desire for the conversion to LED lights as described in paragraph 11 of the petition, please explain any disincentives in the current market environment for the conversion that necessitate this program, and how the program provides incentives or removes disincentives for the conversion to LED lights.

16. Please refer the Participant's Test results included in Exhibit A, page 7. Please specify whether the Participant's Test conducted here is representative of the change in tariffs proposed by the Company in Docket 20170198-EI.
17. Please specify if all participants for this program would receive a rate impact benefit. If not, please specify how many would have rate increases, and how many would have no change in rates.
18. For each class of lighting, please provide the amount paid under the company's existing tariffs, the proposed amount to be paid under the proposed tariffs, the estimated savings/(costs) per participant, the estimated number of participants, and the total savings/(costs) by class.
19. Please refer to Exhibit A of the petition, page 5.
  - a. Please explain the reason supporting the use of the specific escalation factor.
  - b. Please explain the reason for using \$180.00 for utility non-recurring program cost per customer instead of \$180.06.
  - c. Please provide a version of the cost-effectiveness analysis without an escalation factor using \$180.06 for utility non-recurring cost.
20. Please refer to pages 1 and 2 of the company's petition. For the Metal Halide ("MH") and High-Pressure Sodium ("HPS") street and outdoor luminaires, please identify the depreciation account(s) into which these luminaires are booked, the applicable amortization or depreciation rate for each such account, and the Commission order by which the aforementioned rate was authorized.
21. Please refer to page 1 of the company's petition and quantify the amount of "associated communication expenditures."
22. On page 2 of the petition, the company indicated that it "is seeking approval to recover the unamortized costs for MH and HPS luminaires" which are of \$37,780,595, as of August 31, 2017. Please clarify whether these are the assets for which the company is requesting a capital recovery schedule in Docket No. 20170198-EI. If not, please explain.
23. Referring to page 2 of the petition, please explain in detail how TECO proposes to recover the unamortized MH and HPS-associated costs "at a rate to coincide with conversion of the luminaires." Please also specify the dates for commencing and closing the recovery period.
24. What is the estimated unamortized amount for the eligible luminaires as of the recovery period commencement date?

Staff's First Data Request  
Docket No. 20170199-EI  
Page 4

Please file all responses electronically no later than Thursday, October 19, 2017 from the Commission's website at [www.floridapsc.com](http://www.floridapsc.com), by selecting the Clerk's Office tab and Electronic Filing Web Form. Please feel free to call me at (850) 413-6584 if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

*/s/ Walt L. Trierweiler*

Walt L. Trierweiler  
Senior Attorney

WLT/as

cc: Office of Commission Clerk